

DEGREE CONDITIONS FOR MATCHABILITY IN 3-PARTITE HYPERGRAPHS

RON AHARONI, ELI BERGER, DANI KOTLAR, AND RAN ZIV

ABSTRACT. We study conjectures relating degree conditions in 3-partite hypergraphs to the matching number of the hypergraph, and use topological methods to prove special cases. In particular, we prove a strong version of a theorem of Drisko [14] (as generalized by the first two authors [2]), that every family of $2n - 1$ matchings of size n in a bipartite graph has a partial rainbow matching of size n . We show that milder restrictions on the sizes of the matchings suffice. Another result that is strengthened is a theorem of Cameron and Wanless [11], that every Latin square has a diagonal (permutation submatrix) in which no symbol appears more than twice. We show that the same is true under the weaker condition that the square is row-Latin.

1. RAINBOW MATCHINGS AND MATCHINGS IN 3-PARTITE 3-UNIFORM HYPERGRAPHS

All conjectures and results mentioned in this paper can be traced back to a by now well known conjecture of Ryser [20], that for n odd every Latin square possesses a full transversal, namely a permutation submatrix with distinct symbols. Brualdi [10] and Stein [21] conjectured that for general n , every $n \times n$ Latin square possesses a partial transversal of size $n - 1$. Stein [21] generalized this still further, replacing the Latinity condition by the milder requirement that each of the n symbols appears in n cells (implying, among other things, that each cell contains precisely one symbol). See [22] for a survey on these conjectures and related results.

These conjectures can be formulated in the terminology of 3-partite hypergraphs. We say that a pair (X, Y) of sides of a k -partite hypergraph H is *simple* if no pair (x, y) with $x \in X, y \in Y$ appears in more than one edge of H . A hypergraph is called *simple* if no edge repeats more than once. In this terminology, an $n \times n$ Latin square is an n -regular 3-partite hypergraph with all sides of size n , and all three pairs of sides being simple. For a hypergraph H denote by $\nu(H)$ the maximal size of a matching in H . In this language the Brualdi-Stein conjecture is:

Conjecture 1.1. *Let H be an n -regular 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , all of size n , and assume that all three pairs of sides, (A, B) , (B, C) and (A, C) , are simple. Then $\nu(H) \geq n - 1$.*

While Stein's conjecture is:

Conjecture 1.2. *Let H be an n -regular 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , all of size n , and assume that the pair (A, B) is simple. Then $\nu(H) \geq n - 1$.*

In fact, we believe that an even stronger (and more simply stated) conjecture is true:

Conjecture 1.3. *Let H be a simple n -regular 3-partite hypergraph with sides of size n . Then $\nu(H) \geq n - 1$.*

In the final section of this paper we shall present some yet more general conjectures. But let us first turn to a concept pertinent to these conjectures, that of *rainbow matchings*. Given a family $F_1, \dots, F_m$ of sets, a choice $f_1 \in F_1, \dots, f_m \in F_m$ is called a *rainbow set*. If the elements of the sets F_i are themselves sets, and if the sets f_i are disjoint, then the rainbow set is called a *rainbow matching*. If the elements of the sets in F_i are edges of a bipartite graph G , then a rainbow matching is a matching in a 3-partite hypergraph, in which the vertices of one side represent the sets F_i , and the other two sides are those of G .

A generalization of Conjecture 1.2 was proposed in [2]:

The research of the first author was supported by BSF grant no. 2006099, by ISF grant no. 1581/12, by the Technion's research promotion fund, and by the Discont Bank chair.

The research of the second author was supported by BSF grant no. 2006099, and by ISF grant no. 1581/12.

Conjecture 1.4. *Any n matchings of size n in a bipartite graph have a partial rainbow matching of size $n - 1$.*

Many partial results have been obtained on this conjecture, see, e.g., [23, 15, 5, 16, 8, 12, 13, 19].

What happens if we demand that $\nu \geq n$, rather than $n - 1$, or in the terminology of rainbow matchings we want a rainbow matching of size n ? Strangely, we need to almost double the requirement on the number of matchings. Drisko [14] proved a theorem which was later generalized in [2] to:

Theorem 1.5. *A family of $2n - 1$ matchings of size n in a bipartite graph has a rainbow matching of size n .*

This is sharp - repeating $n - 1$ times each of the matchings consisting respectively of the even edges in C_{2n} and the odd edges in C_{2n} shows that $2n - 2$ matchings do not suffice. In [7] this was shown to be the only example demonstrating the sharpness of the theorem.

In 3-partite hypergraphs terminology, Theorem 1.5 reads:

Theorem 1.6. *Let H be a 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , and assume that*

- (1) $|A| = 2n - 1$.
- (2) $\deg(a) = n$ for every $a \in A$.
- (3) *The pairs (A, B) and (A, C) are simple.*

Then $\nu(H) \geq n$.

It is plausible that condition (3) in this theorem is too restrictive.

Conjecture 1.7. *Let H be a 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , and assume that*

- (1) $|A| \geq 2n - 1$.
- (2) $\deg(a) \geq n$ for every $a \in A$.
- (3) $\deg(v) \leq 2n - 1$ for every $v \in B \cup C$.

Then $\nu(H) \geq n$.

The proofs of Theorem 1.5 given in [14, 2] were combinatorial. A topological proof yields a stronger version:

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ be a bipartite graph and let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{2n-1}\}$ be a family of matchings in $\mathcal{G}$ so that $|F_i| \geq i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ and $|F_i| = n$ for $i = n, \dots, 2n - 1$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ has a rainbow matching of size n .*

In fact, this condition is also necessary. Call a sequence of numbers $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{2n-1}$ *accommodating* if every family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{2n-1}\}$ of matchings in a bipartite graph satisfying $|F_i| \geq a_i$ has a rainbow matching of size n .

Theorem 1.9. *A sequence $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{2n-1}$ is accommodating if and only if $a_i \geq \min(i, n)$ for all $i \leq 2n - 1$.*

We call a pair (X, Y) of sides in a k -partite hypergraph H *p-simple* if no pair (x, y) , for $x \in X, y \in Y$ is contained in more than p edges of H .

The following is a special case of Conjecture 1.7:

Theorem 1.10. *Let H be a 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , and assume that*

- (1) $|A| \geq 2n - 1$ and $|B| = |C| = n$,
- (2) $\deg(a) = n$ for every $a \in A$, and
- (3) *The pair (A, C) is simple and the pair (B, C) is 2-simple.*

Then $\nu(H) \geq n$.

This theorem will yield a strengthening of the following result of Cameron and Wanless [11], which can be regarded as “half” of Conjecture 1.2:

Theorem 1.11. *Every Latin square contains a permutation submatrix in which no symbol appears more than twice.*

For a set S of vertices in a hypergraph H let $\delta(S)$ (resp. $\Delta(S)$) be the minimal (resp. maximal) degree of a vertex in S . In this terminology, Theorem 1.11 is:

Theorem 1.12. *Let H be an n -regular 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C such that $|A| = |B| = |C| = n$, and all pairs of sides are simple. Then there exists a set F of n edges, satisfying*

- (1) $\Delta_F(B \cup C) = \delta_F(B \cup C) = 1$
- (2) $\Delta_F(A) \leq 2$.

Here the vertices in A represent symbols, those in B represent columns, and those in C represent rows. Theorem 1.12 follows quite directly from Theorem 1.5:

Proof. For each $a \in A$ let $M_a = N_a = \{(b, c) \mid b \in B, c \in C \mid (a, b, c) \in H\}$. By the simplicity assumption, these are matchings of size n . By Theorem 1.5, the set of matchings $\{M_a \mid a \in A\} \cup \{N_a \mid a \in A\}$ possesses a rainbow matching R of size n . Defining $F = \{(a, b, c) \mid (b, c) \in R\}$ yields the desired result. $\square$

The topological tools will allow us to strengthen Theorem 1.11 to row-Latin squares, namely squares in which no symbol appears twice in the same row (but may appear more than once in the same column). In 3-partite hypergraph terminology:

Theorem 1.13. *For the conclusion of Theorem 1.12 to hold it suffices that the two pairs (A, C) and (B, C) are simple.*

Of course, by symmetry, it suffices also to assume that (A, B) and (B, C) are simple.

2. A TOPOLOGICAL TOOL

For a graph G denote by $\mathcal{I}(G)$ the complex (closed down hypergraph) of independent sets in G . If $G = L(H)$, the line graph of a hypergraph H , then $\mathcal{I}(G)$ is the complex of matchings in H . A simplicial complex $\mathcal{C}$ is called (homologically) k -connected if for every $-1 \leq j \leq k$, the j -th reduced simplicial homology group of $\mathcal{C}$ with rational coefficients $\tilde{H}_j(\mathcal{C})$ vanishes. The (homological) *connectivity* $\eta_H(\mathcal{C})$ is the largest k for which $\mathcal{C}$ is k -connected, plus 2.

Remark 2.1.

- (a) This is a shifted (by 2) version of the usual definition of connectivity. The shift simplifies the statements below, as well as the statements of basic properties of the connectivity parameter.
- (b) If $\tilde{H}_j(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ for all j then we define $\eta_H(\mathcal{C}) = \infty$.
- (c) There exists also a homotopical notion of connectivity, $\eta_h(\mathcal{C})$: it is the minimal dimension of a “hole” in the complex. The first topological version of Hall’s theorem [6] used that notion. The relationship between the two parameters is that $\eta_H \geq \eta_h$ for all complexes, and if $\eta_h(\mathcal{C}) \geq 3$, meaning that the complex is simply connected, then $\eta_H(\mathcal{C}) = \eta_h(\mathcal{C})$. All facts mentioned in this article (in particular, the main tool we use, the Meshulam game) apply also to η_h .

Notation 2.2. Given sets $(V_i)_{i=1}^n$ and a subset I of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, we write V_I for $\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i$. For $A \subseteq V(G)$ we denote by $\mathcal{I}(G) \upharpoonright A$ the complex of independent sets in the graph induced by G on A .

Given sets $(V_i)_{i=1}^n$ of vertices in a graph G , an *independent transversal* is an independent set containing at least one vertex from each V_i . Note that in this definition the transversal needs not be injective, namely a set V_i may be represented twice, which makes a difference if the sets are not disjoint. In our application (as is the case in the most common applications of the theorem) the sets V_i are disjoint, in which case the transversal may well be assumed to be injective.

The following is a topological version of Hall’s theorem:

Theorem 2.3. *If $\eta_H(\mathcal{I}(G) \upharpoonright V_I) \geq |I|$ for every $I \subseteq [n]$ then there exists an independent transversal.*

Variants of this theorem appeared implicitly in [6] and [17], and the theorem is stated and proved explicitly as Proposition 1.6 in [18].

A standard argument of adding dummy vertices yields the deficiency version of Theorem 2.3:

Theorem 2.4. *If $\eta_H(\mathcal{I}(G[\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i])) \geq |I| - d$ for every $I \subseteq [m]$ then the system has a partial independent transversal of size $m - d$.*

In order to apply these theorems, combinatorially formulated lower bounds on $\eta_H(\mathcal{I}(G))$ are needed. One such bound is due to Meshulam [18] and is conveniently expressed in terms of a game between two players, CON and NON, on the graph G . CON wants to show high connectivity, NON wants to thwart her attempt. At each step, CON chooses an edge e from the graph remaining at this stage, where in the first step the graph is G . NON can then either

- (1) Delete e from the graph. We call such a step a “deletion”, and denote the resulting graph by “ $G - e$ ”.
- or
- (2) Remove the two endpoints of e , together with all neighbors of these vertices and the edges incident to them, from the graph. We call such a step an “explosion”, and denote the resulting graph by “ $G * e$ ”.

The result of the game (payoff to CON) is defined as follows: if at some point there remains an isolated vertex, the result is ∞ . Otherwise, at some point all vertices have disappeared, in which case the result of the game is the number of explosion steps. We define $\Psi(G)$ as the value of the game, i.e., the maximum payoff to CON in an optimal play of both players.

Theorem 2.5. [18] $\eta_H(\mathcal{I}(G)) \geq \Psi(G)$.

Remark 2.6. This formulation of Ψ is equivalent to a recursive definition of $\Psi(G)$ as the maximum over all edges of G , of $\min(\Psi(G - e), \Psi(G * e) + 1)$. For an explicit proof of Theorem 2.5 using the recursive definition of Ψ , see Theorem 1 in [1]. The “game” formulation first appeared in [4].

We shall use the Meshulam bound on line graphs. If $G = L(H)$ then playing the game means that CON offers NON a pair of edges in H having a common vertex. Deletion in G corresponds to separating the two edges at the vertex where they meet. Explosion corresponds to removing the three endpoints of these edges.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.9

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a bipartite graph with sides U, W , and assume that there exist $u_1, \dots, u_{2\ell-1} \in U$ satisfying $\deg(u_i) \geq \min(i, \ell)$ for all $i \leq 2\ell - 1$. Then $\Psi(L(G)) \geq \ell$.*

Proof. By induction on ℓ . For $\ell = 1$ the statement is obvious. For $\ell > 1$ CON chooses an edge $e = u_1 w$ for some $w \in W$, and offers NON in any order all pairs e, f for edges $f = yw \neq e$ (here $y \in U$). Assume first that NON explodes one of these pairs. Since G is simple, the degree of each vertex in $U \cap V(G')$ is reduced by the explosion by at most 1. This implies that the remaining graph G' satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem with $\ell - 1$ replacing ℓ . By the induction hypothesis, we have $\Psi(L(G')) \geq \ell - 1$ and hence $\Psi(L(G)) \geq \ell$.

Next consider the case that NON separates e from f for all $f = yw \neq e$. Then CON offers all pairs e, g for $g = u_1 z \neq e$ (here $z \in W$). NON has to explode one of these pairs, say e, g for $g = u_1 z$, so as not to render e isolated. Since all pairs e, f for $f = yw \neq e$ have been separated, this explosion preserves the vertex w , removing at it only the edge $u_1 w$. Thus, again, the degrees of all $u_i, i > 1$ are reduced by only 1, and the condition of the lemma holds with $\ell - 1$ replacing ℓ . Again, the desired conclusion follows by induction. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.9. For the sufficiency part, let $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{2n-1}$ be a sequence of natural numbers satisfying $a_i \geq \min(i, n)$ for all $i \leq 2n - 1$ and let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{2n-1}\}$ be a family of matchings in a bipartite graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ satisfying $|F_i| \geq a_i$ for all $i \leq 2n - 1$. We need to show that $\mathcal{F}$ has a rainbow matching of size n . Let A and B be the two sides of V and let $m = |A| \geq n$. By considering a third side C of size $2n - 1$ whose vertices correspond to the matchings F_i we obtain a 3-partite 3-hypergraph H . We need to show that H has a matching of size n .

Consider the bipartite graph G induced on B and C . Since the sets F_i are matchings, G is simple. The vertices in A induce a partition $V_1, \dots, V_m$ on $E(G)$. By the hypothesis of the theorem, the vertices of C

can be ordered as c_i , $i \leq 2n - 1$, where $\deg_G(c_i) \geq \min(i, n)$. For $I \subseteq A$ let G^I be the graph with sides B, C induced by I , namely having as edges pairs (b, c) completed by some $a \in I$ to an edge of H . Write $k = |A| - |I|$. Since the sets F_i are matchings, meaning that the pair of sides (A, C) in H is simple, for every $c \in C$ we have $\deg_{G^I}(c) \geq \deg_G(c) - k$. This entails that the conditions of Lemma 3.1 are valid for G^I with $\ell = n - k$. By the lemma, we have $\eta_H(\mathcal{I}(L(G^I))) \geq n - k$. By Theorem 2.4 this suffices to show that $\nu(H) \geq n$, namely there is a rainbow matching of size n .

For the other direction of the theorem, let $a_1, \dots, a_n$ be an ascending sequence of natural numbers such that $a_k \leq k - 1$ for some $k \leq n$. Let C_{2n} be a cycle of size $2n$ and let $M \cup N$ be a partition of its edges into two matchings, each of size n . Consider the following family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{2n-1}\}$ of matchings. Each of $F_{n+1}, \dots, F_{2n-1}$ is a copy of M . Let $N = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ let F_i be a copy of the matching $\{e_1, \dots, e_{\min(n, a_i)}\}$. Clearly, these matchings satisfy the condition of the theorem. We claim that they do not possess a rainbow matching of size n . Clearly, a matching of size n is contained either in M or in N , and since there are only $n - 1$ matchings F_i that meet M , a rainbow matching of size n must represent the matchings $F_1, \dots, F_n$. But this is impossible, since the union of the matchings $F_1, \dots, F_k$ contain together fewer than k edges. $\square$

It may be worth noting that an analogous version of Conjecture 1.4 fails. Let $Q^1, \dots, Q^{2k}$ be disjoint copies of P_3 , the path with three edges, let O_i be the set of two odd edges in Q^i ($i \leq 2k$), let e_i be the middle edge in Q^i , let $F_i = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ for $i \leq k$, and let $F_i = \bigcup \{O_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq i - k\} \cup \{e_j \mid j > i - k\}$ for $i > k$. Then $|F_i| \geq i$ for all i , and the largest rainbow matching is of size $\lfloor \frac{3k}{2} \rfloor$.

4. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.10 AND 1.13

For the convenience of the reader, let us repeat Theorem 1.10:

Theorem 1.10. *Let H be a 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , and assume that*

- (1) $|A| \geq 2n - 1$ and $|B| = |C| = n$,
- (2) $\deg(a) = n$ for every $a \in A$, and
- (3) *The pair (A, C) is simple and the pair (B, C) is 2-simple.*

Then $\nu(H) \geq n$.

Proof. Since the pair (A, C) is simple, it follows from (2) that the degree of each vertex in C is $|A|$. Since (B, C) is 2-simple, we have

$$(1) \quad \Delta(B) \leq 2n.$$

For $b \in B$ let $V_b = \{(a, c) \mid (a, b, c) \in E(H)\}$ be a set of edges in $A \times C$. We need to show that the sets V_b have a full rainbow matching. For $K \subseteq B$ let G_K be the bipartite graph with sides A and C , and with edge set $\bigcup_{b \in K} V_b$. By Theorems 2.3 and 2.5 it suffices to show that

$$(2) \quad \Psi(\mathcal{I}(L(G_K))) \geq |K|$$

for every set $K \subseteq B$. Write $k = |K|$. The minimal value of $|E(G_K)|$ occurs when all the vertices in $B \setminus K$ have maximal degree, which by (1) means:

$$(3) \quad |E(G_K)| \geq n(2n - 1) - 2n(n - k) = 2nk - n,$$

and by the 2-simplicity of the pair (B, C) we have

$$(4) \quad \Delta_{G_K}(C) \leq 2k.$$

We play Meshulam's game on G_K as follows. Let $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n$ be the vertices of C . For each $i \leq n$ let d_i be the degree of u_i in G_K and assume that $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$. CON goes over the vertices in this order. Let ℓ_i be the degree of u_i at the time it is handled. For each i , if $\ell_i \geq 2$ then CON offers all pairs of edges

meeting at u_i , in any order. This he does until NON explodes a pair, or until all edges meeting at u_i are separated from each other. If $\ell_i < 2$ then u_i is skipped and CON handles the next vertex in the list.

Let p_i be the number of explosions performed until u_i was handled, including the possible explosion at u_i itself. Assume first that for some i NON separated all pairs of edges meeting at u_i and $p_i + \ell_i \geq k$. Let $e_1, \dots, e_{\ell_i}$ be the edges meeting at u_i at the time it is handled and let $w_1, \dots, w_{\ell_i}$ be their corresponding endpoints at A . For each $j = 1, \dots, \ell_i$, CON offers the pairs of edges (e_j, f) for all edges f meeting e_j at w_j . Note that at least one such f exists for each w_j , otherwise e_j is isolated, meaning that the score of the game is ∞ . Also note that NON must explode a pair in each w_j , otherwise the corresponding e_j will become isolated. Thus, CON scores ℓ_i points at u_i , which together with the p_i already scored, the score of the game is at least k .

Hence, if we make the negation assumption that the score of the game is less than k , then for each u_i one of the following two occurs:

POS1: NON exploded a pair at u_i , or

POS2: NON separated all the edges meeting at u_i and $p_i + \ell_i < k$.

In each explosion two vertices from A are removed along with their incident edges. Thus, as G_K is simple, in each explosion the degree of each vertex in C decreases by at most two. Hence,

$$(5) \quad \ell_i \geq d_i - 2p_i \text{ for all } i.$$

Suppose NON separated all the edges meeting at u_i . Then, by POS2 we have $p_i + \ell_i < k$. This together with (5) yield,

Claim 1: If NON separated all the edges meeting at u_i then $d_i < k + p_i$.

For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $\pi_i = p_i + (n - i)$. Note that by the negation assumption $\pi_n = p_n < k$, so there exists a minimal index t for which $\pi_t < k$.

Claim 2: NON separated all the edges meeting at u_t .

Proof of Claim 2. Consider first the case $t = 1$. If NON exploded a pair at u_1 then $p_1 = 1$ and we have $\pi_1 = n \geq k$, contradicting the definition of t . So we may assume that $t > 1$. If NON exploded a pair at u_t then $p_{t-1} = p_t - 1$ and thus $\pi_{t-1} = p_{t-1} + (n - (t - 1)) = p_t - (n - t) < k$, contradicting the minimality of t . $\square$

Now, by the minimality of t we have $\pi_{t-1} = p_{t-1} + (n - (t - 1)) \geq k$ and $\pi_t = p_t + (n - t) < k$. By Claim 2, $p_{t-1} = p_t$. Hence $p_{t-1} + (n - (t - 1)) = k$ and $p_t + (n - t) = k - 1$. Thus

Claim 3: $t = n - k + p_t + 1$.

We calculate an upper bound on $|E(G_K)|$. By Claims 1 and 2 and the fact that the d_i s are ascending we have $d_i < k + p_t$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$. From this and Claim 3, we conclude that the first t vertices are incident to less than $(n - k + p_t + 1)(k + p_t)$ edges in $|E(G_K)|$. By (4) and Claim 3, the remaining $n - t$ edges are incident to at most $(k - p_t - 1)2k$ edges. So, we have,

$$(6) \quad |E(G_K)| < (n - k + p_t + 1)(k + p_t) + (k - p_t - 1)2k.$$

Let $s = k - p_t$. Then (6) can be written in a somewhat simpler form:

$$(7) \quad |E(G_K)| < (n - s + 1)(2k - s) + (s - 1)2k.$$

Let $m = s(n - s + 1)$. Rearranging terms in (7) we obtain

$$(8) \quad |E(G_K)| < 2nk - m,$$

By the negation assumption $s \geq 1$ implying $m \geq n$. By (8) it follows that $|E(G_K)| < 2nk - n$, contradicting (3). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Let A' be the union of two identical copies of A , that is, $A' = A \cup A^\dagger$, where $A^\dagger = \{a^\dagger \mid a \in A\}$ and let H' be the hypergraph with sides A', B, C , defined by $E(H') = E(H) \cup \{(a^\dagger, b, c) \mid (a, b, c) \in H\}$. We have $|A'| = 2n$. Also, since (A, C) is simple so is (A', C) , and since (B, C) is simple, the pair (B, C) is 2-simple in H' . By Theorem 1.10, we have $\nu(H') = n$, which implies the desired result. $\square$

5. POSSIBLE GENERALIZATIONS

In [8] the following conjecture was proposed:

Conjecture 5.1. *Let H be a simple 3-partite d -regular hypergraph with sides of size n .*

- (1) *If $d \leq n$ then $\nu(H) \geq \frac{d-1}{d}n$.*
- (2) *If $d \geq 2n - 1$ then $\nu(H) = n$.*

Part (1) would imply Conjecture 1.3. Part (2) is sharp. To see this, let a, b, c be vertices in the respective sides A, B, C of a hypergraph H with $|A| = |B| = |C| = n$, put in $E(H)$ the set $\{(a, b, x) \mid x \in C \setminus \{c\}\} \cup \{(a, y, c) \mid y \in B \setminus \{b\}\} \cup \{(z, b, c) \mid z \in A \setminus \{a\}\}$, and complete it to a $2n - 2$ regular hypergraph by adding edges not containing any of a, b, c . In such a hypergraph $\nu \leq n - 1$, since a, b, c cannot be covered by the same matching.

An asymmetric formulation of the conjecture may better capture its essence:

Conjecture 5.2. *Let H be a simple 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C .*

- (1) *If $d = \delta(A) \geq \Delta(B \cup C)$ then $\nu(H) \geq \frac{d-1}{d}|A|$.*
- (2) *If $\delta(A) \geq \max(\Delta(B \cup C), 2|A| - 1)$ then $\nu(H) = |A|$.*

Remark 5.3. Theorem 2.3 can be used to prove that if $\delta(A) \geq 2\Delta(B \cup C) - 1$ then $\nu(H) = |A|$.

Note that in item (2) there is a jump by a factor of 2 with respect to (1), similar to that between Conjecture 1.4 and Theorem 1.5. By (1) to get $\nu(H) \geq |A| - 1$ we only (conjecturally) need $\delta(A) \geq \max(\Delta(B \cup C), |A|)$.

A conjecture generalizing Theorem 1.5 in the same spirit is:

Conjecture 5.4. *Let H be a simple 3-partite hypergraph with sides A, B, C , and suppose that $|A| = 2n - 1$, $\deg(a) \geq n$ for all $a \in A$, and $\deg(v) \leq 2n - 1$ for all $v \in B \cup C$. Then $\nu(H) \geq n$.*

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Adamaszek and J. A. Barmak, On a lower bound for the connectivity of the independence complex of a graph, *Discrete Math.* **311** (2011), 2566–2569.
- [2] R. Aharoni and E. Berger, *Rainbow matchings in r -partite r -graphs*, Electron. J. Combin **16** (2009), no. 1, R119.
- [3] R. Aharoni, E. Berger, D. Kotlar and R. Ziv, On a conjecture of Stein, *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg*, to appear.
- [4] R. Aharoni, E. Berger and R. Ziv, Independent systems of representatives in weighted graphs, *Combinatorica* **27** (2007), 253–267.
- [5] R. Aharoni, P. Charbit, and D. Howard, *On a generalization of the ryser-brualdi-stein conjecture*, Journal of Graph Theory **78** (2015), no. 2, 143–156.
- [6] R. Aharoni and P. Haxell, Hall's theorem for hypergraphs, *J. of Graph Theory* **35** (2000), 83–88.
- [7] R. Aharoni, D. Kotlar, and R. Ziv, The equality case in a theorem of Drisko, submitted.
- [8] R. Aharoni, D. Kotlar, and R. Ziv, *Rainbow matchings for large matchings*, submitted.
- [9] J. Barát, A. Gyárfás, and G. N. Sárközy, private communication.
- [10] R. A. Brualdi and H. J. Ryser, *Combinatorial matrix theory*, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [11] P. J. Cameron, and I. M. Wanless, Covering radius for sets of permutations, *Discrete Mathematics*, **293**(1) (2005), pp. 91–109.
- [12] D. Clemens and J. Ehrenmüller, *An improved bound on the sizes of matchings guaranteeing a rainbow matching*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.00438v1.
- [13] D. Clemens, J. Ehrenmüller and A. Pokrovskiy, *On sets not belonging to algebras and rainbow matchings in graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.06437v1.
- [14] A. A. Drisko, *Transversals in row-latin rectangles*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **84** (1998), no. 2, 181–195.

- [15] P. Hatami and P. W. Shor, A lower bound for the length of a partial transversal in a Latin square, *J. Combin. Theory A* **115**(2008), 1103–1113.
- [16] D. Kotlar and R. Ziv, *Large matchings in bipartite graphs have a rainbow matching*, European Journal of Combinatorics **38** (2014), 97–101.
- [17] R. Meshulam, The clique complex and hypergraph matching, *Combinatorica* **21** (2001), 89–94.
- [18] R. Meshulam, Domination numbers and homology, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* **102** (2003), 321–330.
- [19] A. Pokrovskiy, *Rainbow matchings and rainbow connectedness*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.05373.
- [20] H. J. Ryser, *Neuere probleme der kombinatorik*, Vorträge über Kombinatorik, Oberwolfach (1967), 69–91.
- [21] S. K. Stein, *Transversals of latin squares and their generalizations*, Pacific J. Math **59** (1975), no. 2, 567–575.
- [22] Wanless I. M., *Transversals in latin squares: A survey*, Surveys in Combinatorics, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, vol. 392, pp. 403–437, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [23] D.E. Woolbright, An $n \times n$ Latin square has a transversal with at least $n - \sqrt{n}$ distinct elements, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* **24** (1978), 235–237.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TECHNION, HAIFA, ISRAEL

E-mail address, Ron Aharoni: `raharoni@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HAIFA UNIVERSITY, HAIFA 31999, ISRAEL

E-mail address, Eli Berger: `berger.haifa@gmail.com`

COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT, TEL-HAI COLLEGE, UPPER GALILEE, ISRAEL

E-mail address, Dani Kotlar: `dannykotlar@gmail.com`

COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT, TEL-HAI COLLEGE, UPPER GALILEE, ISRAEL

E-mail address, Ran Ziv: `ranzivziv@gmail.com`